IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.3516 OF 2007
DATE OF DECISION: 08-03-2007

Alok Maru son of Sh. Sita Ram, resident Begu Road, Street No.5, Lohia Basti, Sirsa.

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Haryana through Chief Secretary, Government of Haryana, Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.
2. Haryana Staff Selection Commission, through its Secretary, SCO No.114-115, Sector 8-C, Chandigarh.

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM:- **HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ASHUTOSH MOHUNTA**
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R S MADAN

PRESENT: Mr.KS Dhanora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

R S MADAN, J.

In pursuance to the advertisement No.3/2003 Annexure P1, nine posts of Sub-Inspector (Food & Supplies) were advertised by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Chandigarh on 06-07-2003 and the petitioner was called for the interview vide letter Annexure P2 on 30-11-2004. It was on 17-12-2004, the Election Code of Conduct had come into force, as a result thereof the result was not declared by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Chandigarh.

On 05-03-2005, the new Government came into power and on 06-03-2005, vide letter Annexure P3 the Government directed the

Commission not to declare the result of any post on the basis of interview/examination conducted by the Commission. The tenure of the then members of the Haryana Staff Selection Commission came to an end in the month of August, 2005. It was on 21-10-2005, the Government of Haryana appointed new members of Haryana Staff Selection Commission. All the posts mentioned above were re-advertised vide advertisement No.3/2006 Annexure P5.

The claim of the petitioner is that on account of the new advertisement issued by the Commission on 07-03-2006 for the post of 9 posts of Sub-Inspector (Food & Supplies), he has been prejudiced.

We have been informed that the result of the new advertised posts has also been declared.

In the instant case, the petitioner has approached at a belated stage when the posts were advertised on 07-03-2006, selection process has also been completed and result has been declared.

We find that there is no force in the claim of the petitioner. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed.

(R S MADAN)
JUDGE

(ASHUTOSH MOHUNTA)
JUDGE

March 08, 2007
jt